DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 094 118 CE 001 613

AUTHOR MacMichael, David C.
TITLE Career Education--Prognosis for a Policy.
INSTITUTION Stanford Research Inst., Menlo Park, Calif. Educational Policy Research Center.
PUB DATE 10 Sep 71
NOTE 53p.

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$3.15 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Bias; *Career Education; Curriculum; Educational Policy; Educational Theories; Employer Attitudes; Employment Patterns; Females; Job Placement; Males; Occupational Guidance; Potential Dropouts; Student Alienation; *Unemployment; *Vocational Education; *Youth Employment; *Youth Opportunities

ABSTRACT

The author has examined the prospects for successful application of career education principles to the problems of youth unemployment in the United States, the relationship of occupationally relevant content in curricula to school dropout and student alienation, the location and control of youth occupational preparation programs, and the implications of alternate futures for the career education concept. Some significant factors identified in youth unemployment were: (1) institutionalized employment bias against youth (particularly the under-25 male), (2) inexperience in the skill of jobseeking, and (3) the trend to favor the young female over the young male (except in professional/managerial areas). Implications for career education could be: (1) emphasis on jobseeking skills, (2) the encouragement of more young men to train and compete for clerical/office jobs, and (3) more research into adolescent male psychology. Potential dropouts, alienated students, or "non-makers" will benefit as career education concepts broaden the opportunities for the nonacademically gifted; however, the effectiveness of this reform will be dependent on the ability and willingness of employers to absorb and utilize the products of the school. The problem of location of occupational preparation remains complex. Alternate futures of career education are viewed in relation to the structuralist viewpoint. (EA)

ED 094118

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

CE

CAREER EDUCATION--PROGNOSIS FOR A POLICY

David C. MacMicheal

EDUCATION POLICY RESEARCH CENTER
Stanford Research Institute
Menlo Park, California

September 10, 1971

CE 001 613

CAREER EDUCATION--PROGNOSIS FOR A POLICY

Background

Paul R. Messier of the National Center for Educational Research and Development commenting on the initiation of the Career Education policy recently stated: "Intensive research and statistical analysis have revealed unemployability to be a critical problem which reflects upon the American education system."[1] Commissioner of Education Sydney P. Marland, Jr., the author of Career Education, has established as his goal the elimination of that reflection by insuring, through Career Education, "that all children and youth leave school with sufficient skills to obtain employment, pursue further career training, or progress to higher levels of education."[2] Somewhat earlier, then Commissioner of Education James Allen declared:

> Young people enter the job market without the skills and attitudes employers require. They and millions of others who are underemployed--inadequately prepared high school graduates as well as dropouts--are tragic evidence of failure on our part.[3]

Commissioner Marland echoes his predecessor when, after castigating the schools for their derelictions, he concludes, "Certainly it is no assumption but fact that nearly all of our youthful unemployed, those between the ages of 16 and 23, are victims of this shame."[4]

These statements, and their number could be multiplied many times over, reflect acute awareness on the part of educational leaders

of the problem of youth unemployment in the United States. The problem has been chronic since 1953 and has become acute in recent years. For instance, in April 1971 when the overall unemployment rate for males over 16 in the labor force stood at 5.1 percent, the rate for those 16 to 21 was 13.6 percent, for those 20 to 24 it was 9.6 percent. The rate for non-whites in those age groups is much worse.[5]

There is no doubt that this represents a serious situation. Worse, it is one which has no parallel in the industrial countries of Europe where, despite a generally earlier school leaving age, youth unemployment does not exist at a comparable level.

There is considerable debate among economists about the precise nature of the unemployment problem in the United States. Generally speaking, there are two schools of thought. The "aggregate demand" school argues that sufficient stimulation of the economy will induce a demand for labor regardless of skills and that employers, as part of their response to that demand, will either assume the costs of skill training or redesign their work processes in accordance with the skills available in the labor pool. "Structuralists," on the other hand, insist that, at least since World War II, the greatest factor in unemployment has been the absence of people sufficiently skilled to exploit the existing opportunities.[6]

Needless to say, both schools are deeply concerned about the social as well as economic consequences of youth unemployment. It is also hardly necessary to point out that those educators who assume that

the situation is a result of school system failure must be accounted structuralists. Career education, then, is a structuralist remedy The extent to which youth unemployment will respond to that remedy depends in large measure not only on the extent to which the structuralist view is valid but the importance of prior occupational preparation relative to such other structural factors as race, sex, age, mobility, geographic location, etc.

Obviously, there is validity in the structuralist view; obviously, there is validity in the belief that occupational preparation is the most significant element in the structuralist argument. Leaving aside for the moment all the obstacles to the implementation of career education programs, expectations for success of the policy relative to youth unemployment depend entirely on the degree to which structuralism is correct and the relative importance of prior possession of educationally transmissable skills compared to other structural factors. The words of Robert Heilbroner introduce a note of caution:

> ...stress is increasingly placed on measures to assist labor mobility, so that the unemployed can move from distressed to expansive areas, and on the retraining of men for those jobs offered by a technologically fast-moving society.
>
> Retraining is, unfortunately, much easier when it is applied to a relative few persons than when it is proposed as a general public policy affecting large numbers of unemployed. Then the question arises: for what jobs shall the unemployed be trained? Unless we very clearly know the shape of future demand, the risk is that a retraining program will prepare workers only for jobs that may no longer exist when the workers are ready for them. And unless the level of future demand is high even a foresignted program will not effectively solve the unemployment program.[7]

A consideration almost entirely separate from the aggregationalist-structuralist issue but one vital to the career education concept involves the placing and control of, and responsibility for, occupational preparation programs within the educational system rather than in any other institution. On this matter there seems to be some preference among industrial economists for the development of the occupational training base within industry on the grounds that the educational system cannot, by its very nature, be sufficiently responsive to the present skill needs of industry, nor can it for a variety of reasons impart skills as effectively as industry. Furthermore, since the future skill needs of industry cannot be foreseen accurately, attempts by the schools to prepare young people for occupations necessarily will involve a large amount of economically and psychologically wasteful and misdirected effort.*

Other identifiable groups, including both traditional and radical educational theorists, can also be found opposing--often for conflicting reasons--the assignment of occupational preparation as a major task to the schools. The most outspoken and even passionate advocates for the school locus are professional vocational educators. Grant Venn, who may be classed as such, in his Man, Education, and Work, approvingly quoted Lowell Burkett of the American Vocational Association:

> Inasmuch as public educators have not been totally active in supporting the vocational program, other forces of our society have necessarily moved in to fill the void. But, if such movements succeed in removing from the public schools the responsibility for providing vocational training,

---

* For example, Frederick Harbison and Charles A. Meyers, Education, Manpower, and Economic Growth: Strategies of Human Resource Development, (McGraw-Hill, 1964) Harold F. Clark and Harold S. Sloan, Classrooms in the Factories, Fairleigh-Dickinson University, Institute of Research, 1958.

> generations to come will suffer an irretrievable loss. Instead of enjoying the rich advantages of preparation for rewarding and productive living, there is the great risk that they will have only routine training for routine jobs . . . that our society may lose the democratic qualities that have made it great.[8]

In addition to economists and educators, others involved in the debate on the propriety of location include administrators and supporters of public manpower training programs conducted outside the educational system and directors of private occupational training schools. That one of the USOE models for career education appears to allow for assignment of major responsibility to private industry has already roused opposition among vocational educators.*

A secondary issue to which career education addresses itself is the school dropout problem and the related one of disengagement and loss of interest by students who remain in school. Although it is acknowledged that the percentage of entering secondary school students who complete high school has continued to rise, the proponents of career education allege, as do others, that large numbers of students are deeply disaffected by the occupational irrelevance of their studies, particularly the general education courses. They argue that by increasing the career-relevant content of secondary school course work the dropout rate would be further reduced. This result, by decreasing the number of full-time youth jobseekers, would in itself have a favorable statistical effect on the youth unemployment rate. Moreover, the enthusiasm of alienated students would be recaptured and the custodial and disciplinary problems of the schools be ameliorated.**

---

* See, Manpower and Vocational Education Weekly, August 4, 1971, p. 10.

** Health, Education and Welfare Department, "Report of the Inter-Departmental Working Group on Career Education," December 31, 1970, p. 2. Counter to its conclusion the report noted without comment

Underlying all discussion on the above points, but with special reference to the issue of youth unemployment and of social attitudes toward work, there is the question of the shape of the future. If the "View I" future described in previous EPRC publications prevails--retention of existing socio-economic ethics and forms; high growth, high consumption patterns; accelerating scientific and technological application--the expectations for the career education policy are quite different than if the "View II" future, with the changes in social and economic institutions implied in the adoption of a new paradigm, becomes a reality.

The following discussion then, will examine the prospects for successful application of the career education policy under the following headings:

1. The nature of youth unemployment in the United States
2. The relationship of occupationally relevant content in curricula to problems of school dropout and student alienation.
3. The location and control of occupational preparation programs for youth.
4. The implications of alternate futures for the career education concept.

---

that while dropout rates for central city students enrolled in the much-maligned general education courses were high (35-50 percent) the rates for vocational students in the two lowest socio-economic quartiles were as high or higher than for general curriculum students in the same quartiles. The same lack of discrimination between dropout rates for vocational and general education students is documented by Thomas E. Swanstrom, "Out of School Youth, February 1963," in Daniel Schreiber (ed.), Profile of the School Dropout, Vintage Books, New York, 1968, pp. 86-87.

Youth Unemployment

> The values most Americans hold dear include that each man living under equality of opportunity should work at a job of his choice within the limits of his ability, and that economic well-being is indispensable to the freedom and dignity of the individual. . . .our present educational system has failed us in achieving these goals.[9]

This statement by the Chairman of the National Advisory Council on Vocational Education embodies much of the complete faith of those structuralists who hold that the American economy can give every individual a worthwhile and dignified employment provided that the educational system offers the necessary preparation. It embodies, too, the accusation that the educational system does not now offer the necessary preparation and is thus to blame for the existence of unemployment.

Charles L. Schultze and his colleagues succinctly summarize the position of

> . . .structuralists who argued that most of the then-current /1960-61/ unemployment resulted from a mismatch between a rising demand for skilled labor and a redundant supply of unskilled workers. They believed that neither public job creation nor increasing aggregate demand would provide the solution. Rather, they contended that major job training programs and other structural adjustments were necessary to bring the supply of labor into line with the demand, qualitatively as well as quantitatively, and that if this was done the jobs would be there.[6]

An earlier generation, it might be noted appropriately here, held a similar view of the importance of job preparation through formal education. E. Wight Bakke's studies of the unemployed during the Depression showed a consistent belief by those out of work that their situation was largely their own fault and that a major cause

of their illfortune was their failure to have taken advantage of educational opportunity. An important difference must be observed, however; the Depression unemployed believed that the school system had not failed them, they had failed to use the school system to their advantage.[10]

This view of the cause of unemployment is not only structural but elevates educational preparation to the position of controlling element among structural factors. It reflects a natural subjective tendency among educators to assume the importance of their contribution and especially, the desire of vocational educators to call attention to what they see as their thwarted potential. Additionally, it reveals belief in the individualistic ethic. According to this belief it is the individual and his preparation that count. And the American social, political, and economic system necessarily rewards the individual in proportion to his efforts, of which educational effort is, of course, an important part. It is not surprising that during a period of rapid economic and social change when, despite evidence of considerable system success in responding to the demands that change has imposed, evidence of partial system failure in some areas--of which youth unemployment is one--has raised serious questions about the long range viability of the system and the validity of its underlying ethic, there should be a certain amount of scapegoating by those who remain committed to the system and ethic. In the present case it is the educational system, and particularly those now directing it who, in the opinion

of career education proponents, have mistakenly perverted the occupational preparation role of the school to follow the false gods of academicism and have thus contributed to, if not caused, youth unemployment and the related problem of youth alienation from traditional national ideals.[11]

While structuralists, at least within the career education camp, tend overwhelmingly to be economic traditionalists,* the economists and social commentators who view youth unemployment from the aggregationist point of view range across the spectrum of ideology. Nevertheless, they are to a large degree united in agreement on the validity of the thesis of the British economist A. W. Phillips that the level of employment in an industrial society is a function of the rate of inflation. As inflation rises unemployment decreases. Expanding on the thesis to take account of skill requirements, Dale T. Mortensen of Northwestern University writes: "During periods of excess demand for (supply of) labor, each employer simultaneously attempts to raise (lower) his own money wage offer relative to the general level and to lower (raise) the level of skill he requires of new employees."[12] Mortensen points out that once the employer makes his decision to lower the skill requirement for a new employee he has his choice of accepting lower productivity or assuming the expense of training to a higher standard. The choice is based entirely on cost-effectiveness considerations.[12]

---

* Structuralists who emphasize other elements, such as race or sex, rather than education are less likely to be committed to traditional values.

All parties to the debate thus far subscribe to full employment doctrine. None question the ability of the economy to make employment opportunities available nor the necessity, in terms of the psychological requirements of individuals and the health of society generally, for adults to have income-legitimizing work to perform. For purposes of simplicity this discussion will not include the views of non-subscribers such as Robert Theobald[13] who argue that in the modern industrial economy attempts at full employment are socially and economically unsound and foredoomed to failure. The extent to which such views are valid, of course, is crucial to the whole future of American society, not only for career education. However, the analysis here will only consider the two schools who assign great or little importance, as a condition of full employment, to occupational preparation prior to jobseeking by those entering the work force or changing jobs, voluntarily or involuntarily.

It is also important to note that structuralists tend to discuss unemployment at the microeconomic level, and there is evidence that on a case-by-case basis they have a strong brief. At any given moment there is a particular job unfilled because of the inability of the employer to locate a qualified worker.

Aggregationists, as the term implies, tend to a macroeconomic view. While granting the validity of any given structuralist case that may be cited they dismiss the overall value of a response to any significant unemployment situation that relies on improving the qualifications of jobseekers. In Leon H. Keyserling's words:

> Of course there is always need for programs to educate, train and retrain, and relocate workers. But every period of reasonably full employment--above all the World War II period--has taught us that fitting the worker to the job is a relatively minor problem when the jobs are there.[14]

The experience of the United States economy during the 1960s, which saw the decade open with an unacceptable rate of overall unemployment and a much higher rate of youth unemployment, followed by a rapid reduction of unemployment levels due to Vietnam War industrial and armed forces expansion, and, finally, a return to almost the same overall and youth unemployment situation by 1970, provided economists an opportunity to estimate the validity of the two schools of thought. The Department of Labor, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, and the Office of Education (through the Vocational Education Act of 1963) all had programs designed to raise worker qualifications. The results, so far as they can be adjusted to allow for the impact of the Vietnam War, do not allow for optimistic assessment of the potential of structural approaches. The Brookings Institution summarizes:

> Manpower training programs in the 1960s proved to be considerably less successful than had been hoped. On the one hand, when unemployment was high, subsidized training programs in private industry tended to shrink, since employers were laying off workers generally. And in publicly run training programs, those who completed training could often find no jobs available. On the other hand, when unemployment was low, trainees were mainly the hardcore unemployed. Programs that succeeded in retaining and placing a high percentage of trainees (75 percent is considered a good success rate for a manpower training program) were those whose trainees were chiefly prime age men with some recent work experience. Success rates were far lower for women, teenagers, and men who had not worked for a long time.*[6]

---

* Note that by the 75 percent standard the secondary schools under existing policies would have to be accounted highly successful manpower training agencies, since their retention and placement rates are consistently higher.

Experience thus far in the 1970s where unemployment has again risen to the levels of the early 1960s and again includes significant numbers of skilled and experienced workers and a growing number of recent graduates of colleges and universities, is further evidence for the thesis that the structural element is secondary.

One would have to conclude, therefore, that any approach to unemployment generally or to youth unemployment especially, that elevates the structural factor to the ominant position will fail.

To conclude that the structural element in the American employment situation is secondary to the aggregational is not to conclude that it is unimportant. On the contrary, the fact that during the full employment years of the mid-1960s youth (age 16 to 24) unemployment remained consistently at close to 9 percent indicates that the structural factor of youth itself, for one, played an important part in the overall unemployment situation. In addition, race, sex, marital status, place of residence, and years of formal education can be extracted from Department of Labor statistics to isolate other structural elements in the equation. For those concerned with the potential of career education the task is to determine the extent to which the overall problem of unemployment, insofar as it is structural, is rooted in the amount and nature of the educational preparation of jobseekers and, hence, amenable to educational remedy. Conversely, it remains to estimate the relative weight of other structural factors that have little or nothing to do with educational input.

Even limited examination of Department of Labor statistics on unemployment shows such a strict correlation of chronological age and unemployment rates as to raise the question of whether a person under 25 must not, under present conditions, be considered as inherently less employable than an older person regardless of educational and training input.[15] Even after allowing for the probability that the ablest and most employable among the 16 to 24 age group voluntarily postpone their entrance into the labor force until age 25 it is difficult to explain the dramatic difference in employment rate that takes place after age 25. For example, in April of 1971, 9.6 percent of males aged 20 to 24 years were unemployed. But during the same month those 25 to 29 had only a 4.7 percent unemployment rate. In that month 16 to 17 year olds had a 17.4 percent unemployment figure while the rate for 18 and 19 year olds was 13 percent.[16]

Quite clearly persons without high school diplomas are over-represented in the 16 to 17 year old sample, and it is more than probable that the educational and vocational training input of 16 to 24 year olds increases with chronological age. However, these additional inputs would not by themselves seem sufficient to explain the massive difference in unemployment rates. Two other factors might be considered: one is simple experience; the other, institutional and popular impediments to youth employment.

With regard to experience, employment theory predicates jobseeker ignorance about labor market conditions--types and locations of jobs available, wages offered, and skills required. It is only through

the process of jobseeking that ignorance is reduced. Obviously, the longer one seeks employment, assuming that he does not suffer permanent morale damage in the process, the more skillful and knowledgeable he becomes. Hence, the less prolonged become his periods of unemployment. Inevitably, the learning process involves a great deal of floundering and wasted effort. For all that, the experience is, in the broad sense, educational, and one of the very defensible objectives of career education is to institutionalize it and make it insofar as possible part of the formal school activity. The point, though, is that the inexperienced youth, regardless of skills or attitudes, is at some disadvantage in the competition for employment.*

Probably more important are the legal and popular impediments to youth employment. With regard to the latter, it is no secret that adolescent males are regarded as less reliable employees than older men. Everything else being equal an employer will prefer "the mature man" to the person under 25.

Recognizing this and the fact that the supply of under-25 workers was growing faster than the work force as a whole the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress recommended in 1966 that industry make a conscious effort to lower age requirements and develop special means to employ younger workers.[17] It is by now clear that no such special efforts are being made, and the youth unemployment problem continues to grow as a partial result.

---

* Herbert Bienstock, "Realities of the Job Market for the High School Dropout," in Daniel Schreiber (ed.), Profile of the School Dropout, p. 115, "The rate of unemployment for both dropouts and graduates declined as they grew older and obtained more job experience. However, school dropouts are not able to overcome many of their disadvantages and continue to suffer from considerably more unemployment than graduates." See also Daniel Schreiber, "Work Experience Programs," Idem, p. 244-5 citing S. M. Miller, The Syracuse Dropout, University of Syracuse, 1963.

Symptoms of the distrust of young male workers and contributors to their unemployability are such obvious roadblocks imposed as the demand for a high school diploma, the often-demanded requirement that draft age youth have completed military service prior to hiring, the prohibition on employment in places serving alcoholic beverages for those under 21, the extra insurance costs incurred by employers of motor vehicle drivers under 25, the refusal of bonding companies to bond persons under 21, and wholesale restriction on many kinds of public employment to those under 21.* Certainly, there are solid actuarial grounds supported by psychological studies to underpin popular feelings about the adolescent or young male as a reliable, i.e., docile, worker.[18] It may be that the schools can help to overcome some of this through instillation of attitudes toward work more acceptable to employers, but the extent to which the schools can influence the attitudes of employers toward young male job aspirants is questionable.**

Indeed, one of the apparently most effective ways in which the youth bias can be overcome is through marriage. Department of Labor statistics reveal that the unemployment rate for married men 16 to 24 years of age stood at 6.6 percent, far below the overall rate for

---

* In an exemplary case the Board of Supervisors of San Mateo County, California, this month refused the low bid on a janitorial contract proffered by two 19-year-old entrepreneurs on advice of the district attorney who counseled that their age made them ineligible to contract.

** Daniel Schreiber, "Work Experience Programs," Idem, pp. 247-9. The situation is not new. See Ernest C. Comstock, "Vocational Education and Life Adjustment," in Harl R. Douglass (ed.), Education for Life Adjustment, Ronald Press, New York, 1950, p. 248: "Research studies have proved that employers are more concerned with the habits, attitudes, and behavior of a youthful applicant than they are with the applicant's special skills."

for the age group[19] and not far off the overall 5.1 percent rate. Family responsibility is believed to make the worker more "responsible" and also marriage removes some of the legal restrictions on the minor. No doubt the youthful family head is more avid in pursuit of the job than his single contemporary, too. chicken or egg?

Another structural factor is that of sex. To this point this discussion, as do most others, has concentrated on youth unemployment as essentially a male problem. The reason for this is the cultural one, the young male, far more than the female, seems to need income legitimizing employment as a condition of adulthood. Yet during the past decade employment opportunities for women have been growing at a faster rate than for men. Blue collar job opportunities have dwindled while the number of clerical and service positions have increased; also the number of positions from which women are barred for reasons having to do only with physical strength are disappearing.

Far more than young men, young women are considered as desirable (reliable, docile) employees.[20] Additionally, the job skills most often demanded of women, particularly clerical skills, are traditionally and effectively transmitted in the public school setting.* It is, therefore, likely that male youth employment will be more and

---

* It is significant that the inclusion of office occupations under the Vocational Education Act of 1963 produced the only genuine growth in vocational education enrollments during the decade and that the overwhelming majority of enrollees are women. The Report of the National Commission on Technology, Appendix, Vol. I, p. I-11 notes an increase in male competition for "traditional" women's jobs--teaching, social work, and librarianship--but not in office work.

more adversely affected as the economy becomes more and more service-oriented and as physical strength becomes less a competitive factor in employment.

Geographic location is, of course, an important restraint, and one that might be considered aggregational as well as structural. Certainly, in this area the young jobseeker without family ties should have the advantage of mobility over the older man. Equipped with a skill and knowledge of employment opportunity the jobseeker should be able to go from a less favored to a more favored area. On the other hand, one would suppose that employers would seek to locate their facilities in areas where a trained labor force was readily available.

With regard to this last point it should be of interest to those concerned with career education to consider that over the last 30 years the trend within the United States has been for employers to transfer their operations from areas possessing greater numbers of skilled workers with higher average levels of formal education and greater access to vocational training, to regions less favorably endowed in these respects. The trend is expressed in the much greater growth of non-agricultural and manufacturing employment in the East South Central, South Atlantic, West South Central, and Mountain states than in the traditional manufacturing and commercial Northeast, Middle Atlantic, East North Central and West North Central regions[21] whose educational systems continue superior, both academically and vocationally, to those of other regions, particularly the South. Another

expression of the trend is the increasing transfer of even high technology manufacturing operations to areas outside the United States where lower wages, labor docility, lower taxes, and lack of government regulation result in reduced costs that offset whatever lower productivity occurs from the use of less educated and skilled labor.*

The latter situation, of course, requiring as it does the transcending of political and cultural boundaries reduces to almost no value at all the mobility of the young American jobseeker.

More clearly than anything else this national and international trend among employers to depreciate formal education and skills among the work force in favor of other labor selection factors raises the possibility that, especially in the aggregate sense, possession of vocational skills and aptitudes may not be as important to the youthful jobseeker as career education advocates seem to presume.**

---

* Ralph E. Winter, "Made in ???," Wall Street Journal, August 10, 1971, pp. 1, 19. The related situation in Europe involves a reverse procedure--the import of scores of thousands of totally unskilled and barely literate Turks, Algerians, Sicilians, Portuguese and others to fill jobs in the sophisticated and technologically advanced industries of Northern Europe. For detailed discussion of labor force development in non-industrial countries see Frederick Harbison and Charles A. Meyers, Education, Manpower, and Economic Growth: Strategies of Human Resource Development, (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1964.) Robert M. Hutchins decries the necessity of education for economic functioning in an automated society and points to an automated plant in West Germany "staffed largely by illiterate Spanish women who cannot speak a word of German," "The Institutional Illusion," The Center Magazine, (July-August 1971,) p. 45.

** A related phenomenon that particularly affects ethnic minorities and other disadvantaged groups is the emigration of industry and commerce from central cities to the suburbs with readily observable affects on access of ghetto dwellers to jobs. Although access to skilled labor plays some part in the decision of business firms to move from the cities, major factors seem to be taxes, level of services,

It is difficult to decide whether the matter of automation belongs in a discussion of structural factors. Certainly, whether or not automation results in increase or decrease in aggregate demand for workers is a key question that is not strictly structural in nature. However, since full employment policy assumes provision of some kind of job opportunity with government as employer of last resort in event the result is aggreagte decrease, that question can be overlooked here while attention is directed toward that of the nature of work in a more fully automated society and its implications for a career education policy.

There are essentially two diametrically opposed ideas on the subject. One holds that automated technology will demand higher levels of skill in the work force; the other that just the opposite will result. Conferenceson automation regularly bring together experts who deliver absolutely conflicting opinions.* The most impressive arguments for the lesser skill side are marshalled by James R. Bright who, on the basis of numerous micro-studies conducted from the mid-1950s to the mid-1960s, concluded that not only does automation produce a demand for a less-skilled work force (after an initial

---

transportation, aesthetics, and race. Certainly this trend is reflected in both the higher rates of unemployment among central city youth and the much larger percentage of high income youth holding part-time jobs while enrolled in school. Bernard Michael and Margo Lauria "Issue Study: Secondary Vocational Education," USOE, Office of Program Planning and Evaluation,(May 1971,)pp. 3-4, p. 25.

* As one among many see Wayne L. Hodges and Matthew A. Kelly (eds.), Technological Change and Human Development: An International Conference at Jerusalem, New York, 1970.

period of demand for increased numbers of very highly skilled trouble-shooters who "de-bug" the automated installation) but that by a sort of Gresham's Law the high technology economy automatically adjusts its machinery to a level of simplicity matching the level of skill most easily found in the work force.*

Some discussions prefer to plead lack of sufficient prophetic insight and only to assume the greater probability of higher skill requirements but without any ability to say what particular skills these might be. However, it is presumed that there will be rapid change in demand for skills and that the worker must be prepared as never before to change occupations and accept training in new and unfamiliar areas.** The assumption that job and skill change requirements will be rapid and continual points up the semantic contradiction in the term career education. "Career" by dictionary definition is "3. the course of a person's life, especially in some particular pursuit. 4. . .progress of success in one's chosen calling." A USOE staff study says bluntly, "most workers. . .do not have careers. They hold a series of jobs which are likely to be unrelated. . . ." It is further assumed in most discussions that the trend to more

---

* James R. Bright, "The Relationship of Increasing Automation and Skill Requirements," in Report of the National Commission on Technology, Appendix, Vol. II, p. II-221, "Machinery gradually evolves to provide that degree of automatic operation justified by economics, and having a simplicity of operation and maintenance that is economically supportable by the level of skill that can be made readily available in the existing work force."

** Roger Gregoire, Vocational Education,(Jnited States Publication, OECD, Paris, 1967;) Ben-Ami Friederich, "Changing Skill Requirements, Job Training, Motivation, and Mobility," in Hodges and Kelly (eds.), Technological Change and Human Development, pp. 99-115, insists

clerical and service (white collar) jobs in the American economy will continue and that this trend implies the need for more worker skill. Such skills, however, would appear to be less precise or demanding than those involved in industrial production and could be categorized as personal relation skills. The National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, pointing to the shift from blue collar to white collar employment cautioned, ". . .the meaning of this trend in terms of skill is far from clear. Many manual jobs are highly skilled, many clerical and sales jobs are unskilled. The requirements are different but not easily compared."[22]

From the above discussion of structural factors it would seem reasonable to conclude the following:

1. There is institutionalized employment bias against youth, particularly the under-25 male.

---

that the primary task of education is to prepare naturally reluctant people to accept a life model of constant job change and retraining. Alvin Toffler, Future Shock, Random House, New York, 1970, p. 160, questions man's psychological and physiological ability to withstand the strain of frequent imposed occupational change. However, Grant Venn, Man, Education, and Work, p. 130, notes an already high rate of imposed and disliked job change among American blue collar workers. Eve Mueller, et al, Technological Advance in an Expanding Economy: Its Impact on a Cross Section of the Labor Force, (University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, 1969,)pp. 1-15, makes the same point. Office of Program Planning and Evaluation, USOE, "An Issue Study: Secondary Vocational Education, May 1971, p. 41, cites studies showing the typical non-college graduate holds 12 different jobs in a 46-year working life and only one man in five can expect to remain in the same major occupational category for his whole working life.

2. Inexperience in the skill of jobseeking is a significant factor in youth unemployment.

3. A long term trend in the nature of occupations favors the young female over the young male as a jobseeker, except in the professional and managerial areas.

4. An imbalance in the number of under-25 jobseekers relative to the number of older persons in the labor force during the past decade and continuing but declining in importance in the 1970s exacerbates the effect of other structural factors.

5. A continuing trend among American employers to locate manufacturing facilities away from areas of high educational and technological skill indicates less reliance on labor force quality as a factor in industrial decision making.

6. The long term impact of automation is still a moot question. However, there exists the strong possibility that overall the automated economy will require fewer persons with technical or mechanical skills, but these will be of a very high level. Furthermore, the precise nature of these skills cannot be determined; it is certain only that there will be frequent and radical changes in the skills demanded. Insofar as sales, clerical, managerial, and personal service jobs will continue to increase as a proportion of total employment and are considered as requiring a higher level of "skill" (although many of the skills will be in the ill-defined area of personal relations) higher skill levels will be required of job applicants.

It follows then:

a) That the structural factor most amenable to the formal educational process would be that of jobseeking skill. And, certainly, a major effort in this area is implied in the career education emphasis on improvement in guidance, counseling, work experience programs, and job placement.[23] Indeed, almost the entire content of the home based career education model seems to be information about employment opportunities.

b) Since the job market is being feminized, as it were, while youth unemployment is still characterized as an essentially male problem, the schools, as part of the guidance effort, could encourage more young men to train and compete for clerical and office jobs.

c) It is possible that, as part of the career education objective of instilling appropriate attitudes toward work, research into adolescent male psychology will provide some clues that might assist in the important part of that problem represented by the existence of formal and informal barriers to the employment of young men.

d) The extent to which the school system, particularly the secondary school, should attempt to impart specific vocational skill, requires separate discussion (see below).

e) Obviously, the schools, as agencies that act on students--potential jobseekers--can do little to affect the existing demographic imbalance in the labor force nor can they require employers either to override biases against youth employment or to reverse the trend toward the export of employment opportunities.

Dropouts, Alienated Students and Career Education

The secondary school dropout today is indeed a disadvantaged minority. Increasingly, the high school diploma, undifferentiated as to quality, is demanded as the passport to any kind of employment at all without any particular regard to the relevance of academic preparation for the job.* Increasingly, too, he is in more and more of a minority. Fewer secondary school students today fail to complete high school than ever before.[24] Indeed, as Thomas F. Green of the Syracuse University Educational Policy Research Center points out with some truth:

> The reason we have a dropout problem in this country is not because there are lots of dropouts but because there are not lots of them. In a society where there are lots of dropouts, being one is no problem.[25]

The social, economic, mental and other characteristics of the "dropout" have been adequately presented elsewhere.[26] For purposes of career education analysis the categories devised by EPRC Syracuse of "makers," "non-makers," and "post-makers" seem most useful for discussing the heterogeneous youth who make up both the dropout and alienated student groups.[27] Briefly, "makers" are the majority of secondary school students. They will either go on to college or terminate formal education on graduation from high school. Regardless, they attempt to and do meet the academic and socialization requirements of the secondary school and expect that as a result the society will reward them with appropriate positions in the economy. They believe both that the existing society and economy are appropriately organized for the distribution of rights, obligations, and rewards and that

---

* I. Berg, Education and Jobs. Note, however, the implications of the Griggs vs. Duke Power Company decision, (1971), in which the U.S. Supreme Court held that the company was in violation of the Civil

the school system is the appropriate means for entering that society and economy.*

"Non-makers" are the minority who accept, as do the "makers" both the society and the school. In school they attempt to meet academic and socialization requirements, but fail. Consequently, they regard themselves as failures and expect that society will only have for them low status positions and minimal (if any) rewards. This group--slow learners, and children with personality defects that may be expressed in various unacceptable ways--are the dropouts who might be classified as "pushed outs."**

Finally, "post-makers" are those who march to different drummers. They either do not accept the overall goals of society as being worth pursuing, or they may not accept the school as an appropriate or desirable means of "making it." Many in this group are easily c[redacted]e of meeting the academic and socialization requirements of the s[redacted]. Some choose to do so; some do not. Some drop out; some do not. It

---

Rights Act of 1964 when it required the diploma or passage of educational equivalency tests for applicants for jobs for which it could not demonstrate the relevance of the educational prerequisite. Tom Wicker, "The Economy and Blacks," New York Times, Sunday, July 25, 1971, p. E 11.

* Arthur Pearl, "Slim and None; the Poors' Two Chances," in Profile of the School Dropout, Schrieber (ed.), p. 320, writes: "A middle-class child may find rules stupid, may bridle because of his powerlessness, may find most of the courses meaningless--but these are obstacles he is willing to suffer because he knows at the end there is a place for him."

** Ivan Illich, "A Constitution for Cultural Revolution," in Illich, Celebration of Awareness,(Doubleday, New York, 1970,) p. 182, "More and more men begin to believe that, in the schooling game, the loser gets only what he deserves. The belief in the ability of schools to label people correctly is already so strong that people accept their vocational and marital fate with a gamblers resignation."

is this group that includes the widest range of intelligences, capabilities, and behavior patterns. The "post-makers" also include, as a major sub-category, young people who consciously or unconsciously believe that the society and economy are so badly organized and inequitable that for the (usually ethnic) groups with which they are identified there is no real possibility of "making it."

There is little doubt that both "non-makers" and "post-makers" make up the bulk of those problems that may be described loosely as custodial* for the schools and as socially pathologic for the larger community. The hope of career education is that by including a wider range of non-academic activity--especially work-related activity--in the curriculum, the "non-makers" whose overall problem is lack of academically oriented intellectual capacity may find it possible to meet the requirements and be transformed into "makers" with consequent removal of the failure stigma and the consequences thereof both for the individual and the society. Insofar as "post-makers" are concerned the hope appears to be that by breaking down the wall between the larger society and the school, particularly between the workplace and the school, those who reject that society partly through ignorance of its real nature may, through exposure to reality, come to reconsider.**

---

* Robert M. Hutchins, The University of Utopia, Chicago, 1953, referred to the secondary schools as "a custodial system. . .for the nonpenal accommodation of the young," Quoted in Jurgen Herbst, "High School and Youth in America," Walter Laqueur and George L. Mosse (eds.), Education and Social Structure in the Twentieth Century, Journal of Contemporary History, 6, Harper Torchbook, 1967, p. 166.

** Roy J. Harris, Jr., "At Some Scout Posts Campfire Stories Are Lectures on Business," Wall Street Journal, August 16, 1971, pp. 1, 12. The objectives of joint big business and boy scout-sponsored programs

Additionally, by increasing opportunity for employment, both while in school and afterward, that group of "post-makers" who had previously judged the possibility of "making it" as hopeless may re-evaluate their chances more favorably.

As noted earlier, the percentage of school-age youth completing high school continues to increase. By that rough gauge one might argue that the number of "makers" is also increasing. And why not? The relationship between lengthier formal education and higher status and pay has been amply demonstrated during the past. True, the connection may not be entirely rational, as Ivar Berg argues, but it remains a fact of life. However, it is also true that growing acceptance of that fact by no means implies commitment to its validity. Thus, the "makers" may include large numbers of "rice Christians" as well as true believers. As an indication of student cynicism about the "making" relationship consider the following by economics students at a California state college:

> . . . why is it that so many students are going on to higher education today? . . . President Nixon in commenting on this increasing enrollment trend said that 'too many people have fallen prey to the myth that a four-year liberal arts diploma is essential to a full and rewarding life . . . ' The President was right, but unfortunately the people who have fallen prey to the myth are the people who establish the competitive standards for employment. Everyone knows of the television ad that says stay in school and get a good job. We have all heard about the high school dropout who spends his time looking for a job only to see the boy who graduated get it. Is the four-year diploma really a myth then? Take the high school dropout phenonomena /sic/ one step further, the college dropout. Who gets the job when two people apply and

---

of business familiarization and training are expressed here: "Many of the businessmen and scouting officials involved in corporate scouting see the program as an important method to overcome anti-business attitudes prevalent among the nation's youth. 'The explorer finds out capitalism isn't so evil when he rubs shoulders with an Ed Gott (Chairman of U.S. Steel)' says Randolf B. Kohl, National Director of Exploring for the scouts. 'Then when he runs into some nutty college professor who tells him the whole system is no good, he can tell the professor it's not so.'"

> and only one has the four-year degree? Even further? Who gets the job when two degree holders apply but one has a Master's Degree? Our first impulse may be to throw up our hands and ask where does it all end, but it is important that we face up to the connection between education and employment. What is happening is that our young people are going on to higher education, whether it be at the junior college level, college or graduate level, in order to be better able to compete for employment possibilities. . . .
>
> If we as members of society continue to allow our system of higher education to be used against us (italics added) in this fashion, how can we then expect enrollment to subside? Quite obviously, we cannot since education is the individual's only hedge against unemployment. . . .We have let our system of . . . .education turn into--a credentialling system and an instrument for prolonged entrance into the labor market.[28]

Most interestingly, there is no defense in this paper of studenthood as a necessary preparation to perform a job; only an insistence that it is necessary to get a job.

Robert Ulich of Harvard, in his comparative study of world educational systems, The Education of Nations, notes an important distinction between American and Western European societies in this regard. Americans tend, at least, to acquiesce in the process of postponing employment and lengthening the educational period. European governments, according to Ulich, have encountered popular "apathy if not opposition" to plans to extend compulsory education to the ninth and tenth years.[29]

The significant inference remains, though, that the faith of the "makers" in the value of prolonged education is to a large degree dependent on the reality of the reward promised. The highly-publicized

difficulties encountered by college graduates of 1970 and 1971 as they entered the job market may, if they continue as a feature of the long term youth unemployment situation,* lead to erosion of faith and a growth in the ranks of "post-makers."

However, if we can assume that for the immediate future the trend will be toward a decrease in the dropout rate as, willy nilly, the necessity of extended education is accepted by more and more students as a prerequisite to any kind of employment and, very probably, more jurisdictions move to make high school completion compulsory the custodial problem for educators will be to make the curriculum less frustrating and defeating for non-makers and more relevant and productive for the less than committed "makers." Those "post-makers,"actual or potential, who are subject to reclamation will also be affected.

It seems self-evident that nothing but good can come from a program that allows "non-makers" to emerge from the school experience with their esteem intact. To some extent, as critics of the public schools charge, this is currently being attempted through policies of "failing to fail" even semi-illiterates through lowering or non-application of academic standards. The self-defeating aspects of this are obvious. A career education concept that broadens the concept of what constitutes educational subject matter and allows the non-academically gifted to receive credit for his ability to perform equally valid tasks not in the traditional curriculum should

---

* Drucker, "Surprising Seventies," believes it will.

be both more effective and more humane. Another reform often suggested in connection with the career education concept and apparently directed at the "non-makers" is that of allowing students to reach a level of competence in a given area without regard to the time it takes to reach that level. This, too, would tend to reduce failure without sacrificing standards of competence.

However, as with all else about career education, the reforms, however attractive and valuable in themselves, depend very largely for their effectiveness on the ability and willingness of employers to absorb and utilize the products of the schools. Should the job market not respond it is quite possible that regardless of the problems posed the schools will be required by society to assume even more openly than they do today the function of withholding from the labor market surplus youthful jobseekers. As suggested earlier, it is possible--since the laws of motion hold for society as well as physics--that the long term trend for increasing the period of compulsory school attendance will continue and reach what one might see as its natural culmination in a requirement that everyone either complete secondary school or at least remain there until age 18. This would have the effect of removing from the job market a considerable portion of the present group of unemployed youth, and, since the schools could not legally encourage dropping out for the less talented, there would have to be special efforts made to eliminate the causes of failure. It is probable that these would require more intensive pre-secondary efforts to make sure that slow learners carried basic reading, writing, and arithmetic skills into high school as well as remedial secondary programs.[30]

Again assuming that the labor market remains less than fully responsive to the employment needs of youth, with the probable consequence of negating the positive effects of career education programs, one looks to the past for clues to the future. Almost inevitably it would be supposed that either the educational system or some other agency would provide CCC-like opportunities for youth, especially male youth, on the model of the various alternate-to-military service programs that have been proposed.

Such programs were suggested seriously by former Secretary of Labor Willard Wirtz. Wirtz left no doubt that for youth unable to secure other employment, such work experience "opportunities" might well be compulsory.* Insofar as such programs are included in the school curriculum and justified as necessary to teach work habits and attitudes they may well be accepted by the public at large--and by much of the directly affected population, the students,** as well. Kenneth B. Hoyt of the University of Iowa's School of Education writing on "Education as Preparation for Employment" in the Report of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress established as his second basic assumption that the "desire to be gainfully employed" is a value that the schools must encourage and "when necessary" impose "on all who we feel belong in the labor market." Obviously, if compulsory education includes work experience, then work experience logically will be compulsory, too.

---

* See especially the extensive quotes from Wirtz' November 1966 speech at Catholic University in Kelso and Hetter, Two-Factor Theory, p. 162.

** See, however, the uncompromising opposition to involuntary social service programs voiced by the 1971 White House Conference on Youth, Recommendation 1.2, Task Force on the Draft, National Service and Alternatives, printed in Prometheus, July 1971, p. 39.

Hoyt went on to state, also as a basic assumption, that for those who don't accept the value, supplementary educational experience is necessary. While protesting the importance of individual freedom, he concluded:

> Our societal system emphasizes maximum freedom to choose, and the welfare of all who accept and seek to implement the societal value of desire for gainful employment. Conversely, societal goals sometimes take precedence over both individual freedom to choose and the welfare of the individual when this societal value cannot be accepted and/or implemented through formal education.[31]

It would appear, then, that in the absence of any significant reversal of existing youth employment trends that the custodial role of the school system will increase in importance and in difficulty. And, it is largely the extent to which jobs for youth become available that career education, as presently conceived, can turn "non-makers," the paramount custodial problem, into "makers."

The alternatives outlined above--increasing the length of compulsory education to remove 16 and 17 year olds from the job market altogether and providing "work opportunity" camps on a massive scale for 18 and 19 year olds--seem predictable developments of career education so long as full employment remains policy, the society demands that the school system produce "makers," and the economy continues to find it difficult to absorb school graduates.*

---

* Youth concern with this problem is shown in Recommendation 1.2, Task Force on the Draft, National Service and Alternatives; and Recommendation 3.3, Task Force on Economy and Employment: Study, Employment and the Academic Year Cycle; White House Conference on Youth, 1971, in Prometheus, July 1971, pp. 39-43.

The Locus of Employment Skills Transmission--The School or the Workplace

Given the less than temperate tone in which the proponents of vocational education in the United States assail the directors of the public school system for their alleged refusal to consider the employment needs of the non-college bound student and their responsibility for the second-class, even punitive, status allegedly assigned to vocational training along with the grossly inadequate grant of financial support,[32] one of the more surprising aspects of published discussions on career education is the vociferousness with which these same people insist that the removal from the public schools of the responsibility for vocational education would be an unconscionable disaster. One of the many close resemblances between the career education concept and the post-World War II "life adjustment" movement* is the undisguised fear of some of their proponents that control and responsibility for occupational preparation or, more narrowly, vocational education, programs would be transferred to non-school agencies. Not too surprisingly, those who equally urge the need for occupational training but deny that the school system has the capability to conduct effective programs of occupational preparation point to the same record of ineffectiveness that vocational educators decry and conclude the contrary - that the programs ought to be placed elsewhere.[32a]

---

* Federal Security Agency, Office of Education, Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth, 1948. This publication could be retitled "Career Education" and reissued today with hardly a change. See especially the section, "Work Experience, Occupational Adjustment, and Competencies," pp. 97-101.

There are two other major parties to the debate. Traditional educators, whose most vigorous spokesmen may be found in the Council for Basic Education, argue that the only appropriate role for the school is the teaching of academic subjects.* Radical education critics, of whom Paul Goodman and Ivan Illich may be used as examples, while disagreeing with the traditionalists on almost any other point, concur that direct occupational preparation is not the school's task.[33] Typically, the traditionalists are simply not concerned with occupational preparation. The radicals, on the other hand are usually deeply involved in the matter, but, as part of their general drive for the "de-schooling" of society, express a decided preference for extra-educational manpower training programs or for requiring, in some manner, business and industry to assume formally the responsibility for training employees. Goodman says:

> The retraining and rehabilitation programs of the Departments of Labor and Justice contain better educational ideas . . . than the direct school-aid bills.
>
> . . . Vocational training, including much laboratory science training, ought to be carried on as technical apprenticeships within the relevant industries. Certainly, the big corporations have a direct responsibility for the future of their young, rather than simply skimming off the cream of those schooled, tested, and graded at the public expense. **

---

* Newsweek, July 19, 1971, pp. 48-49. See also the remarks of Secretary of HEW, Elliott Richardson, to the National Education Association pledging that career education would not "transmogrify" the schools into places for job preparation to the detriment of the real goals of education.

** Goodman, Compulsory Miseducation, p. 151. For another non-school alternative, see Recommendation 4.5, Task Force on Education: Create Community Learning Centers, White House Conference on Youth 1971, in Prometheus, July 1971, pp. 43-44. These Illichian centers are considered necessary because the schools cannot adjust to the task of preparing people for todays world. The recommended "community learning center . . . would marshal the services and make available the cultural (including those of the barrio and the ghetto), educational, and business and industry resources of the total community. The . . . centers would help any learner obtain the kind of relevant

There are other interested groups, as well, although their participation in the debate seems less shrill than that of those thus far identified. The most significant of these are businessmen and the directors of private vocational training schools. The former traditionally voice support for programs of employment preparation in the secondary schools.[34] In practice, however, employers have tended to depreciate the value of secondary school vocational education.[35] Despite the "skimming" and evasion of responsibility charged by Goodman, et al., business does do a great amount of occupational training. Business expenditures for this purpose in the 1969-70 school year were estimated by the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare as at least $2 billion and possibly as much as $13 billion. This compares with a total federal, state, and local expenditure on public school vocational education of only $1.4 billion.

Harbison and Meyers discuss this point as one common to all industrial countries. "The relation between vocational education and industrial training has not been worked out satisfactorily even in the advanced countries. On the one hand there has been a demand for vocational education to provide a marketable skill to youths who do not plan to continue further formal education. On the other hand, employers have usually been critical of the quality of this education and found it necessary to develop their own training programs."[36] Ulich notes a recent failure of an ambitious attempt in the Soviet Union for the same reasons.[37]

---

education that is required by that learner at that time. We conceive of these . . . centers providing education for the world of work, continuing academic studies, or for personal development and fulfillment."

The conclusion drawn by school vocational education supporters from this is interesting. After noting the scope of business training programs, the superficial involvement of industry in public vocational education, and that, "Many employers seem to be opting for workers with higher education rather than vocational training," they argue:

> In any case much closer contact between business and industry and the schools is vital to more effective vocational programs responsible to employer (italics added) as well as student needs.[38]

The proprietary schools, which according to the same HEW estimate, enrolled 1.5 million students at an expenditure level in the same range as that of business and industry during the 1969-70 school year, are excluded from federal support, except through their ability to contract with the public educational and manpower training systems and their certification for veterans training programs. These schools, USOE reports, enroll students from higher socio-economic backgrounds, with higher educational levels, and with more motivation than do public school vocational education programs. Not only that, but USOE concedes them to be far more effective than the public schools in that they offer a greater range and diversity of courses, are more flexible in their offerings, are more market oriented, and have better student job placement services.[38]

Finally, one has to consider the post-secondary non-baccalaureate degree granting institution--the junior college or community college. The potential of this institution as the appropriate locus for specific occupational skill transmission is considerable[39] despite a past record of succumbing to the pressure of academicism.[8]

Discussions on where employment preparation programs should be located usually have at least two points of agreement. One, secondary schools should at a minimum, make students aware of the realities of the "World

of work," and, two, secondary schools have never been able to provide students with significant labor skills.

Even the traditionalists allow the first point. The differences arise over the method of providing this experience and its relative importance in the total educational process. Almost a quarter of a century ago the Office of Education itself made one of the more convincing assessments and did so with disarming candor:

> Since they may change jobs many times in their lives, the boys with whom the /Prosser/ resolution is concerned are likely to need resourcefulness and flexibility to achieve occupational adjustment. They will hold jobs for which they can make little specific preparation while they are still in school. If by actual work experience a boy can learn the types of jobs he dislikes he will have made some progress. (Italics added) If, in addition, he can learn to work 8 hours a day and can attain competency in some one job which he does like he is well on his way toward occupational adjustment.

The same report went on to cite a statement of the National Association of Secondary School Principals that, "Work experience under actual production conditions is necessary if youth are to learn to work efficiently." However, the Office of Education emphasized that the school's role went beyond providing students with the opportunity to learn to submit to demands of the job. It declared:

> The youth can learn and the high schools must provide more than in the past about safety practices, labor problems, relations with employers, working under direction, holding a job, getting promotions, working with others, and a new sense of money values and the like.[40]

It is important to consider that at the time (1945-1947) this report was prepared part-time and summer work opportunities for high school age youth were readily available. The school's problem was to find a means of determining the appropriate academic credit to be awarded for off

campus work.[40] The mechanics of job location could, under the circumstances, be left to the student in the majority of cases.

Under today's conditions, despite the considerable number of students reporting some degree of self-located employment,[38] the problem of providing work experience, especially for ethnic minorities and both the inner city and rural poor--the disadvantaged groups most in need of income, self-esteem, and non-traditional means for educational achievement--has become more difficult.* USOE figures, for example, show the likelihood of a student's having a job increases dramatically with the level of family income.[41] Obviously, even casual employment of the gardening variety is more available to the suburban youth. There are few lawns to mow in Bedford-Stuyvesant. Surely, the experience with school administered work experience programs during the 1960's ought to make policymakers cautious about the possibility of any massive increase in school system responsibility in this area.[42] Not only is the location of suitable student jobs in sufficient number an immense task, but the logistic problem of student movement to and from work and school (assuming the school system will take responsibility for this) and the related problem of administration of the program surely require prior study of the most detailed sort before an assumption is made that the school system can carry the load. For example, USOE estimates the minimum immediate secondary school target population for career education at 2 million.[38] Considered in terms of providing significant work experience alone, the problem posed is enormous. Nevertheless, there is agreement that what

---

* See the recognition of the problem of youth job scarcity in the White House Youth Conference Papers, Prometheus, July 1971, pp. 39-44.

potential exists should be exploited to the maximum. Such agreement, incidentally, dovetails with the widely held opinion that the secondary schools could and should assume more responsibility for and expand their capability for non-academic counseling, guidance, and job placement on the model of college placement bureaus.[43]

Undoubtedly, USOE's proposed employer based career education model is an imaginative and exciting approach to overcoming many of the work experience dilemmas. If the model succeeds in overcoming both the history of failure of such efforts in the past[44] and the very evident opposition to the concept that has already appeared among educationists,* and sufficient business, industry, and labor support is forthcoming it may be possible to come to grips with the very real and certainly insufficiently explored logistic and administrative problems of large scale work experience.

The old problem of school credit for non-classroom work remains. Here the consensus breaks down. Traditionalists, obviously, oppose any significant broadening of the educational range.** Even more broadminded educators seem to hesitate. Schreiber describes a work experience program that failed partly because the employers insisted on giving pay raises and promotions to some students only on the basis of their work performance when the school authorities insisted that their inferior performance in

---

* Manpower and Education Weekly, August 4, 1971, p.10. Consultation with Far West Laboratories personnel on the EBCE model project also reveal educationist opposition to establishment of any alternative school system not closely resembling nor controlled by existing educational leadership. See also, Report on Education Research, July 21, 1971, pp. 8-9 for discussion of EBCE in terms of a near traditional low academic achiever's work experience program.

** San Francisco Examiner, August 29, 1971, p. describes the opposition of the state colleges to accepting junior college transfer credits in any but traditional academic subjects.

the classroom phases of the program should have made them ineligible.* (In a slightly different area, one might recall the resistance of institutions of higher education a year ago when students demanded political science course credit for working in election campaigns.) At the far extreme, are the de-schoolers such as Illich who would not only broaden the range of experiences that should be given academic credit but give to a far wider and diverse group of people the right to certify the value of the experience. And, of course, there remains Robert Hutchins with his long insistence that the answer is to give everyone the B.A. at birth so that the individual might get on with the lifelong educational process without worry about the extraneous degree.

There can be no doubt that there is an enormous inertia within the educational system itself that militates against the adoption of any solution--even the most rational--to the credentialing problem. Without a solution, work experience will have, just as vocational education, per se, is alleged to have, a depreciated value in the credential market.

Against these obvious difficulties must be ranged one enormous advantage for the assignment of primary responsibility for occupational preparation to the schools. Simply, it is that they comprise the one identifiable institution that has physically present and under its control almost the entire youth population up to age 18. Thus, they have an opportunity no other institution has, and the opportunity implies the responsibility.** The problem for the educational system is to maximize the opportunity while assessing realistically whether or not it wants to

---

* Daniel Schreiber, "Work Experience Programs," Profile of the School Dropout, p. 263, USOE, "Life Adjustment Education," p. 100. Of 11 cited "barriers" to conduct of work experience programs six involved academic credentialing of the non-classroom work.

** Hoyt, "Education as Preparation for Employment," Report, National Commission on Technology, IV-92, "Society has charged education to teach youngsters to work, about work and the working world."

be burdened with the entire responsibility.

It seems clear that for reasons intrinsic to the whole process of learning and transmitting work skills there have developed outside the public educational system large and apparently effective mechanisms for worker training. These include business and industry, privately run training schools, and a number of government manpower training programs designed to serve special groups that include, especially, individuals who have previously failed within the school system.

It seems reasonably clear also that even should the reasons intrinsic to the larger process just mentioned be over-ridden, there are inherent in the educational system itself sufficient practical and theoretical obstacles to make it extremely unlikely that the schools could provide substitutes for these mechanisms.

A logical and appropriate strategy for career education would seem to require the following. The school system should assume the responsibility for identifying the work training opportunities available to school leaving youth and for assisting youth in gaining access to them. Above all, the school should see as its chief responsibility in this the delivery to students of basic skills and attitudes prerequisite to the successful use of extra-school occupational training. These basic skills obviously include the ability to read and write, perform arithmetic calculations and use simple mathematical tools, and familiarity with general scientific principles. Additionally, the simple ability to receive and pass on verbal messages is an important communications skill. Work attitudes are difficult to transmit in the context of ethical absolutes, but certainly the social requirements of the workplace are not so different from those of the school that awareness of "what sells" can be absorbed

by most students. It should be apparent that inevitably a curriculum designed to achieve this would resemble more than it differed from the frequently denigrated general education course. Interestingly, the specific business complaints about high school graduates cited by Commissioner Marland in a recent speech endorsing career education had reference only to general educational defects - inability to read and write.[45] Where extra-school opportunities do not exist or are inadequate the schools should, of course, seek to provide them or supplement them. They should not seek to duplicate existing facilities.

However, the fact that these training facilities are not directed nor controlled by the formal educational system should not imply that they do not have or could not have true educational value. There would appear to be a greatly expanded role for vocational educators should the leaders of the educational system insist, as they might do legitimately, that for reasons of coordination of school programs with employer needs (not to mention the primary concern of student needs), school vocational education authorities should be involved in the organization and direction of the whole complex of occupational preparation programs - be they industrial, proprietary, or government (MDTA and EOA as well as school based). Such a coordinating role could not but affect favorably all training programs through the contributions scientific vocational education theory could make and would, or should, develop a mutual appreciation among school and extra-school trainers of the contribution each could make to the problem of bringing well-equipped youth into the work force. The involvement of the educational system in some formal way, moreover, would facilitate solution of the thorny problem of granting academic credit for extra-school experience with demonstrable educa-

tionable value in such a way that the young person who, for one reason or another, seeks that experience does not create obstacles for his return to formal education should that be his future desire. Additionally, such integration might facilitate the introduction and use of voucher or other alternative education funding plans.

The answer to the problem of location of occupational preparation is by no means an easy one. However, to arrive at a satisfactory one does require recognition that a monopoly of such training by the school system is impossible and probably undesirable but that maximum school system involvement in all other programs in a counseling, coordinating, credentialing and funding role would go far to meet the objectives of career education. If, as Clark and Sloan claimed in 1958, industry is compelled in its own interest to become a major force in education,[46] it would seem that the formal educational system should welcome the relief and assistance offered. Vocational educators, in particular, would appear to be the schoolmen destined to benefit most from close and cooperative relations with the industrial training establishment.

There is precedent for such involvement. During the Second World War the Vocational Division of the USOE organized and administered a program for training war production workers carried out largely within industry. Some 11.5 million persons had passed through the program before it ended in 1945.[47] The Bureau of Adult, Vocational, and Technical Education might well examine the possibility of adapting that successful old wartime approach to the problem of full production to the solution of the almost equally pressing peacetime problem of full employment.

Career Education and Alternate Futures

The foregoing discussion has deliberately concentrated on the world as it is. Changes considered have been essentially quantitative--numbers of children in school, numbers of unemployed, numbers of jobs in industry; the assumption throughout has been that during the next decade or so, during which career education programs will be implemented and their results become apparent, there will be no major changes in American social or economic institutions nor in the values nor ethics that underlie them.

Discussion in this manner is consistent with the "least surprises, high growth" future projected as one of two acceptable developments over the next generation by EPRC.[48] Since this future is defined as an extension of status quo, the assumptions about the present nature of American society on which the career education policy is based should hold true. On the other hand, it is equally valid to point out that even if the assumptions are correct, the likely intensification of the very problems career education is intended to solve implies that the gap between problem and solution will be more difficult to close.

On the premise that the major assumptions underlying career education are essentially correct--particularly that the youth unemployment problem in the United States is primarily structural and that the major structural element is insufficient occupational preparation for youth by the public schools; that the apathy and alienation of the secondary school population is primarily a result of the lack of occupational relevance of much high school course work; that the "world of work" increasingly demands trained and skilled workers and is less and less

tolerant of the unskilled; and that the rate of technologically-induced change, already rapid, is accelerating and will demand more and more that workers be flexible and adaptable, able to change from one occupational field to another--there is nothing in this "View I" of the probable future that would argue against the assignment of major educational resources to the support of career education. Indeed, since "View I" allows the supposition that as the pace of growth quickens and the penalty--in the form of being almost totally unable to enter into or, once in, to adjust to the economy and being altogether denied the opportunity for self-support and self-affirmation through employment--for the unprepared person becomes more severe, it is incumbent on the school system to devote its best efforts almost entirely to occupational preparation and, in a reversal of the traditional practice, to subordinate its cultural and academic missions. Perhaps this dictates reversion to the earlier American practice of postponing cultural instruction - through "mechanics institutes", Chautauqua, and the like - to adulthood on the premise that most adults had been required to spend their youth in work or training for work.

Ironically, the more the career education assumptions listed above are incorrect, resulting in a much reduced prospect for success in terms of youth unemployment and student alienation problems, the more necessary, in a View I future, will career education be. The paradox allows of explanation. The school system in the highly competitive, skill-demanding, rapidly changing economy has a moral obligation to provide to the youth which it shuts off from other opportunities for skill learning by means of compulsory attendance laws the most effective training it can during

his years of involuntary studenthood. This would be true even if it were recognized that the major part of the problem of youth unemployment is not related to educational preparation simply because, to the extent that educational preparation is even a minor part of the problem, it is incumbent on the school to take full responsibility for that part. The major difference arising from the questioning of assumptions is that in the latter case the educational establishment need not take complete responsibility for either the existence of the problems nor for their total solution.

However, EPRC has allowed for and found acceptable a second possible future. This "War on Ecosystem Imbalance" a "pervasive, judicious, self-sacrificing" effort to "re-establish a balanced physical ecology, reduce pollution. . . , and to redistribute the flow of material wealth to eliminate extreme domestic poverty" requires for its success "substantial changes in operative cultural values."*

There can be little doubt that "View II", whatever changes occur in social values, will also be a high technology society. The difference, of course, is that technology will be directed increasingly toward the conservation of resources rather than their more rapid consumption. Indeed, a successful war on "imbalance" infers the achievement of stability - economic and social - with significant meaning for the concept and conduct of education, particularly in its occupational preparation aspects.

---

* San Francisco Chronicle, September 7, 1971, pp. 1, 28, for discussion of Washington Center for Metropolitan Studies report on the decline in childbearing in the United States which it attributes to changing attitudes about family size. The report speculates on the affect of such an attitude (value) change on the "growth economy."

View II implies that the cycle of rapid and accelerating, future shock producing, technology-induced change our society is now undergoing will come to an end. Technological change, of course, will continue, but will be more controlled, less threatening, more "natural." Hence, there is not implied that survival need for individuals in the labor force to develop extreme flexibility and adaptability to involuntary occupational change.

As in all the foregoing sections of this discussion of career education the human psychological need for contributing to society through "work" is considered a constant with the consequent requirement that society, through its economy, be so organized as to provide each individual with the opportunity to work. Thus, both View I and View II societies share the full employment policy. However, the stability implies in View II allows at least the hope that patterns of employment will stabilize also.

If this is so the implications are important for career education. If the economic structure to which the student is exposed during his school years will remain essentially the same as that in which he spends his working life not only will his choice of occupation have a greater chance of being a correct one (correct means that he will not have to abandon an occupation involuntarily because of its obsolescence) but that the school, or the educationally-credentialled extra-school agency, will be able to prepare him for it far more effectively. On the other hand, even though the reduced rate of change implies fewer new vocational opportunities during a working lifetime there is no reason to suppose that workers will be locked in to their occupations. The range of job selection

will still be broad and the school, under the career education concept, should have a major role to play in counseling, training, and placing the adult worker who voluntarily changes his field.

In the stable, natural resource conserving economy skill levels -- both in production of goods and their maintenance--will have to be higher since waste will no longer be efficient or tolerable. However, there will be better opportunity for the student to acquire skills before employment and more time, assuming a reduced pace of technological innovation, to refine them on the job.

Once again a paradox may be noted. While the stability implied in View II seems to allow career education a far better chance to be effective than in the View I situation of continuing rapid change, that same stability would also seem to make less necessary, from the point of view of the school leaver's ability to enter and function in the economy, concentration on occupational preparation as a student.

However, in either View I or View II futures the career education concept is defensible if only as a means of alleviating that portion of youth unemployment which can legitimately be attributed to insufficient occupational preparation in secondary schooling and for reducing such student alienation and apathy as can be traced to lack of occupational relevancy in secondary school curricula. More importantly, in either future, adoption of career education and its rejection of sterile academicism will assist in broadening the definition of what constitutes education to include a greatly increased range of economic and related social skills. When this is done a great stride will have been taken toward construction of the true learning society.

CITED REFERENCES

1. Messier, Paul R. "Development Plans in Career Education", draft, DOD/NCERD, April 1, 1971.

2. Commissioner of Education, "Planning Instructions for Fiscal Year 1973 Cycle, USOE Planning Document, no date, approximately April 1, 1971.

3. Quoted in David S. Smoker, Vocational Education: Innovations Revolutionize Career Training, National School Public Relations Association, Washington, D.C., 1971, pp. 1-2.

4. "Education Chief urges shift in emphasis to world of work," Christian Science Monitor, August 7, 1971.

5. U. S. Department of Labor, Bureau of Labor Statistics, Employment and Earnings, Vol. 17, No. 11, Table A-3, May 1971, p.33.

6. Schultze, Charles L., Fried, Edward R., Rivlin, Alice M., Teeter, Nancy H., Setting National Priorities in the 1972 Budget, Brookings Institution, Washington, D.C., 1971, pp.191-203; Heilbroner, Robert, Understanding Macroeconomics, 3rd edition, Prentice Hall, 1970, pp. 211-213, pp. 195-196.

7. Heilbroner, Robert, Understanding Macroeconomics, 3rd edition, Prentice Hall, 1970, p. 212.

8. Venn, Grant, Man, Education, and Work, American Council on Education, Washington, D.C., 1962, p. 142, quoting Lowell Burkett, "Critical Issues in Vocational Education," Vocational Education for Rural America, Gordon Swanson ed., Department of Rural Education, Washington D.C., 1960, p.301.

9. National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, "Fifth Report," June 21, 1971, p.1.

10. Bakke, E. Wight, The Unemployed Work and Citizens Without Work, Yale University Press, New Haven, 1940, cited in Ivar Berg, Education and Jobs: The Great Training Robbery, Pragger, New York, 1970, pp.4-5.

11. National Advisory Council on Vocational Education, "Fifth Report," June 21, 1971, pp.4-5.

12. Mortensen, Dale T., "Job Search, the Duration of Unemployment, and the Phillips Curve," American Economic Review, LX, December, 1970, p.847, pp.856-857.

13. Theobald, Robert, The Economics of Abundance, Pitman, New York, 1970. Also, Louis Kelso and Patricia Hetter, Two-Factor Theory: The Economics of Reality, Vintage Books, New York, 1967.

14. Keyserling, Leon H., "Job-creating Potentials in the Private Sector," Eli E. Cohen and Louise Kapp eds., Manpower Policies for Youth, Columbia University Press, New York, 1966, p.94.

15. Table A-13. Unemployed Persons 16 years and Over and Unemployment Rates by Sex and Age: Annual Averages, 1947-1970. U.S. Department of Labor, A Report on Manpower Requirements, Resources, Utilization, and Training, March 15, 1971.

16. U. S. Department of Labor, Table A-3, Employment and Earnings, May, 1971.

17. National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress. Technology and the American Economy, Appendix, Vol. I., pp.1-11. See also, Peter F. Drucker, "The Surprising Seventies," Harper's Magazine, July 1971, pp.34-35, for emphasis on the demographic impact.

18. Harris, Dale B., "The Role of Work in the Socialization of the Adult," William W. Bricknan and Stanley Lehrer, eds., Automation, Education, and Human Values, School and Society Books, New York, 1966, pp.275-283.

19. U. S. Department of Labor, Table A-8, Employment and Earnings, May, 1971.

20. Schreiber, Daniel, "Work Experience Programs," Profile of the School Dropout, pp. 250-251: Thomas E. Swenstrom, "Out of School Youth, February, 1963," in Idem, p.87.

21. U. S. Department of Labor, Employment and Earnings, May, 1971, pp. 13-15, especially Chart 2; Chart 3; Table 3. Also, John C. McKinney and Linda Brookover Bourgut, "The Changing South: National Incorporation of a Region," American Sociological Review, June, 1971, pp.349-411.

22. National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, Technology and the American Economy, Report C, Vol. I., p.21.

23. Jenn, Man, Education, and Work, pp.147-150. See also James B. Conant, Slums and Suburbs, McGraw-Hill Paperback, 1961, pp.40-43

24. Ginzberg, Eli, "Jobs, Dropouts, and Automation," in Schreiber, ed., Profile of the School Dropout, p.125.

25. Green, Thomas F., "Breaking the System: The Redistribution of Educational and Non-Educational Goods," EPRC, Syracuse, New York, Quarterly Progress Report, March 1-May 31, 1971.

26. Schreiber, ed., Profile of the School Dropout.

27. EPRC, Syracuse, New York, "Comprehensive Career Education Models: Problems and Prospects," June 15, 1971.

28. Senior Seminar in Economic Research, Students' Case Against Tuition, San Jose State College, San Jose, California, 1971, p.3-4.

29. Ulich, Robert, The Education of Nations: A Comparison in Historical Perspective, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, rev. ed. 1967, 340 ff. See also, James Bossett, "Britons Reject U. S. Education Emphasis," Los Angeles Times, June 17, 1971, c-172.

30. Ginzberg, Eli, "Jobs, Dropouts, and Automation," Schreiber, ed., Profile of the School Dropout, p. 132.

31. Hoyt, Kenneth B., "Education as Preparation for Employment," Report of the National Commission on Technology, Automation, and Economic Progress, Technology and the American Economy, Vol. IV, Appendix IV-91.

32. NACVE, Fifth Annual Report; David S. Smoker, Vocational Education: Innovations Revolutionize Career Training, National School Public Relations Association, Washington, D. C., 1971, p.1.

32a. Harbison and Meyers, Education, Manpower, and Economic Growth; Clark and Sloan, Classrooms in the Factories.

33. Goodman, Paul, Compulsory Miseducation, Vintage Paperback, 1964, pp. 54, 151; Illich, "The Futility of Schooling," in Illich, Celebration of Awareness, p. 117.

34. Cremins, Transformation of the School, p. 21.

35. Fisher, Industrial Education, p.113; USOE, Office of Program Planning and Evaluation, "Issue Study, Secondary Vocational Education," May, 1971, p. 13; Clark and Sloan, Classrooms in the Factories.

36. Harbison and Meyers, Education, Manpower and Economic Growth, pp.160-161.

37. Ulich, Robert, The Education of Nations: A Comparison in Historical Perspective, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, rev.ed. 1967, pp. 331-336.

38. USOE, "Issue Study," pp. 12-13, pp.25-26

39. Newsweek, August 29, 1971, p.36

40. USOE, "Life Adjustment Education for Every Youth," pp. 97-98.

41. USOE, "Issue Study," see "Reinecke Probes Youth Job Hiring," San Francisco Chronicle, July 11, 1971, p.7, for a minor but illustrative scandal in California.

42. Schreiber, Daniel, "Work Experience Programs," Profile of the School Dropout, pp. 246-274.

43. Venn, Man, Education, and Work, pp. 147-150; Conant, Slums and Suburbs, p.41; and, most recently, John C. Flanagan, Marion F. Shaycroff, James M. Richard, Jr., John G. Claudy, Project Talent: Five Years After High School, American Institutes for Research, Pittsburgh, 1971, Chapter 8.

44. Fisher, Industrial Education, pp. 107-114.

45. Christian Science Monitor, July 17, 1971.

46. Clark and Sloan, Classrooms in the Factory, p.135.

47. Gaumnitz, Walter H., "Developments in Secondary Education, 1890-1945," in Franklin R. Zeran ed., Life Adjustment Education in Action, New York, 1953, pp. 20-21.

48. Stanford Research Institute, EPRC Research Note, "Alternative Futures: Context in Which Social Indicators Must Work," pp.10-12.